

# **"Liberals and The Empire."**

---

**SHORT HISTORY OF THE BEGINNING AND GROWTH  
OF  
CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT IN CANADA**

**ADDRESS OF  
Mr. N. W. ROWELL, K.C., M.L.A.,**

**Leader of the Ontario Opposition**

**AT DINNER TENDERED BY MONTREAL HARBOR CLUB,  
NOVEMBER 11th, 1912**

**PUBLICATION No. 3**

**ISSUED BY  
CENTRAL INFORMATION OFFICE  
OF THE  
CANADIAN LIBERAL PARTY  
OTTAWA, CANADA**

JL 197

L5

R68

\*\*\*

Liberals and The Empire

SHORT HISTORY OF THE RISING AND GROWTH  
CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT IN CANADA

MR. H. W. ROWELL, K.C., M.L.A.

CANADIAN LIBERAL PARTY  
CENTRAL INFORMATION OFFICE

## **"LIBERALS AND THE EMPIRE."**

---

**Address by Mr. H. W. ROWELL, K.C., Leader of the Ontario  
Opposition, at Dinner tendered by Montreal Reform  
Club, November 11th, 1912**

---

At the complimentary dinner, tendered to Mr. Newton W. Rowell, K.C., of Toronto, Leader of the Ontario Opposition, by the Montreal Reform Club, at the Club Rooms, on Monday, November 11th, Mr. Rowell spoke on "Liberals and the Empire."

Mr. Leon Garneau, President of the Club, presided, and introduced Mr. Rowell, who addressed the gathering as follows:—

Mr. President and Gentlemen:—

It is indeed a pleasure to me to come to the City of Montreal and enjoy the hospitality of this Club, so courteously extended to me. I recall with very great pleasure the demonstration which the Liberals of Montreal tendered last May to our honoured chieftain in Dominion affairs, Sir Wilfrid Laurier. I enjoyed that gathering so much that I made up my mind, when I received your kind invitation, I would certainly accept it if I could make my plans to do so.

You know there are times when even a Liberal may feel lonesome—times when one is surrounded by many of the enemy, and it makes one feel very comfortable to be in the midst of his friends, and to be received with the cordiality you have manifested tonight. I felt I was coming back to visit friends in coming here tonight.

I have chosen as my subject for this evening one that should be of great interest to all Canadians. I shall address you upon the question of

### **Liberals and the Empire.**

In all discussions of the relations of Canada to Great Britain and the other parts of the Empire, three questions appear to be uppermost

in the public mind; our political relations, our trade arrangements and the defence of the Empire.

I am glad we have with us this evening a descendant of Papineau, a man, who, in the early history of our country, struggled to secure for the people of this Province what William Lyon Mackenzie was struggling to secure for the people of Upper Canada—the right to manage their own affairs; and while we may not agree with the methods either pursued, we must agree that they were fighting against grave abuses and were struggling to redress serious injustice to the mass of the people of the two Provinces.

The Rebellion of 1837, and the exceedingly able report of Lord Durham on the political conditions in Canada which followed the Rebellion, constitute a convenient starting point for our discussion. Permit me to recall to your minds the records of the two political parties in this country from the Rebellion of 1837 down to the year 1911 on the three questions I have mentioned.

### **Political Relations.**

The four main events in the development of our political relations during this period were: (1) the struggle for and securing of responsible government; (2) Canadian Confederation, including the purchase of the North-west Territories; (3) the evolution of Canada from the position of a colony of Great Britain to that of one of the free self-governing nations of the Empire; (4) the creation of a truly Imperial organization under the name of "The Imperial Conference."

### **Responsible Government.**

Prior to the Act of Union of 1841, the Governments of the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada were carried on by Governors sent out from Great Britain, acting upon instructions from the Colonial Office and upon the advice of advisers in Canada, chosen by themselves to assist them in the government. The Legislative Assemblies, elected by the people, were powerless to control the action of the Governors. It was this state of affairs that gave rise to the Rebellion, and it was against this condition of affairs that Lord Durham so strongly reported.

The Act of Union was intended to remedy this condition, and to give the Legislative Assembly control, but without the sympathetic co-operation of the Governor this was impossible, and it was not until 1847, when Lord Elgin became Governor, that responsible government was really secured to the people of Canada.

The contention of the Liberal party, then known as the Reform party, both before and after the Rebellion was, that the Governor should call to his counsel the men who possessed the confidence of the majority in the Assembly and should act on their advice, just as the Governor-General of Canada today calls to his counsel those who possess the confidence of the majority in Parliament, and acts on their advice. The Liberals demanded that the advisers of the Crown should be responsible to the Assembly, elected by the people, and when they could no longer command the confidence and support of the majority of the Assembly, they must retire. This demand was what is popularly known as the demand for "responsible government." Everybody accepts this view today, but 70 years ago it was considered by its opponents a violent and radical departure from sound principles of Colonial Government and as likely to sever the tie which bound Canada to the mother country.

The contention of the Conservative party, then known as the Tory party, both before and after the rebellion, was that the Governor was sent out to govern, that it was his duty to call to his council the men in the colony whom he considered best fitted to advise him, and that he, with their advice and assistance, should govern, consulting the Assembly as far as he and they considered wise.

Around this issue the battle waged for years, Baldwin and Lafontaine leading the Liberal forces.

The Conservatives charged the Liberals with being disloyal; they stated that the demand for responsible government meant republicanism, that it meant annexation to the United States. We can scarcely imagine the bitterness of the controversy between the two political parties on this issue. Even the Indians were enlisted by the Tories in their cause, and the Chiefs of one of the Iroquois tribes issued a proclamation, in which they said "The real issue is, whether the country is to remain under the protection and government of the Queen or become one of the United States." This reminds us very forcibly of some things we have heard in more recent times, with just as much truth and no more.

The Liberals believed that we could not have peace, progress and prosperity in this country unless the people were allowed to govern themselves in their own domestic concerns, and that so far from this imperilling the tie which bound Canada to the mother country, they held that the very best way to promote loyalty to the Crown and Throne was to secure a happy, contented and prosperous people.

In order that we may the better appreciate the real character of the struggle which the Liberals had to wage, and the importance and far reaching significance of the victory they achieved, we must bear in mind the attitude, not only of the Conservative party in Canada, but of the Conservative party and many of the leaders of the Liberal party in Great Britain. The Conservative party in Great Britain clung just as tenaciously to government by Downing Street as did the Conservatives in this country. Lord Stanley, the Colonial Secretary in the then Conservative government in Great Britain, in the year 1844, in what was known in Canada as the "Great Debate," said:—"Place the Governor of Canada in a state of absolute dependence on his Council, and they at once would make Canada an independent and republican colony. It was inconsistent with a monarchical government that the Governor should be nominally responsible, and yet was to be stripped of all power and authority, and to be reduced to that degree of power which was vested in the Sovereign of this country; it was inconsistent with Colonial dependence altogether and was overlooking altogether the distinction which must subsist between an independent country and a country subject to the domination of the mother country." Lord Stanley apparently persisted in dividing the Canadians into two groups, one of rebels and the other of honest men, and viewed the controversy over responsible government as a strife between the two. In concluding his address, he referred to Baldwin and Lafontaine as "unprincipled demagogues" and "mischievous advisers." Lord John Russell, who was leader of the Liberal Opposition at this time, appears in some respects at least to have largely shared the views of Lord Stanley as to the principles applicable to colonial government. There were some members of the Liberal party in Great Britain who took an entirely different view. They held that the people of Canada were entitled to govern themselves, but they shared the view of Lord Stanley and Lord John Russell that the granting of responsible government might lead to the severance of the tie between Canada and Great Britain; believing thoroughly however in the right of the people of Canada to govern themselves, they were prepared to see this tie severed. The only party that believed in responsible government as being essential to the progress and prosperity of Canada, and that the granting of this right of self government would not only not weaken but strengthen our loyalty to the Crown and the mother country, was the Liberal party in Canada.

Fortunately for Canada, fortunately for Great Britain and the Empire, Lord Elgin was appointed Governor-General in 1847. A



son-in-law of Lord Durham, he shared to the full Lord Durham's view that the people of Canada were entitled to responsible government and that such government was consistent with the maintenance of the Imperial tie, and under Lord Elgin as Governor-General and Baldwin and Lafontaine as his chief advisers, responsible government was fully conceded and secured. Compare the Canadian Tory allegation that Baldwin was disloyal and the English Tory allegation that he was an "unprincipled demagogue," with Lord Elgin's estimate, when he had time to study conditions in Canada, "Baldwin is worth three regiments to the British connection."

The result of the Conservative policy was the Family Compact, the Rebellion of 1837, and the long and bitter struggle which retarded the progress and development of Canada, and divided the people of Canada into two hostile camps. The result of the Liberal policy was the securing for Canada—and ultimately not only for Canada but the other colonies of the Empire—of the right to manage their own affairs, and with that right the peace and progress of the country, and a great increase in affection for and the desire to maintain British connection. Professor Leacock declares that responsible government thus fought for and secured by Robert Baldwin and his colleagues is today the corner-stone of our Imperial system. Sir Herbert Samuel, speaking at the British Association for the Advancement of Science in September last, said "Two great discoveries in the sphere of government have been made by the British people, discoveries which have moulded the shape of the modern world. The first was the principle of representation, which alone had enabled order to be reconciled with liberty. The other was colonial self government, which alone had enabled autonomy to be reconciled with unity." This great discovery of colonial self government, which, according to Sir Herbert Samuel, is one of the two great contributions in the sphere of government which the British people have given to the world, was made, was wrought out and secured by the Liberal party in Canada. Their labour has made the Empire as it exists today possible.

As a matter of history, it is not without interest to know how the Tories accepted their defeat in this great struggle. One of the most important bills of the Parliament of Canada to which Lord Elgin found it his duty to assent, because his responsible advisers had promoted and carried the bills through the Parliament of Canada, was known as "The Rebellion Losses Bill," the object of which was to do a measure of justice to the French-Canadian people of this Province, who had suffered financial loss through the Rebellion. The

Conservatives in the Legislature were violently opposed to it. They claimed that it was rewarding rebels. They thought the Governor-General should, as preceding Governors had done, ignore the advice of his responsible advisers, accept the advice of the Tories, and refuse to assent to the Bill. But Lord Elgin had too firm a grasp of sound constitutional principles to act in this way. He signed the Bill. The rage of our Conservative friends in this good City of Montreal found vent in the mobbing of the Governor-General, and the burning down of the Parliament buildings, but in due time their wrath subsided and they became just as strong and stout defenders of the right of self-government as they had previously been its opponents.

### Canadian Confederation.

I shall not attempt to apportion the credit due to the statesmen of both political parties in this country who promoted and carried through this great constitutional change. It, however, is not without interest to recall a few of the most significant facts leading up to the union of all the Provinces of Canada.

I am under the impression that the first resolution introduced into the old Parliament of Canada in favour of confederation of the two Canadas, was in 1856 by an illustrious son of the Province of Quebec, that great Liberal Sir Antoine A. Dorion; and in the year 1858 the Brown-Dorion Liberal administration was formed, to settle the constitutional question, either by a federation of the two Provinces or by representation according to population.

This Government, as you know, was defeated before it had an opportunity of undertaking the task.

In this same session of the Legislature, Mr. A. T. Galt moved certain resolutions favoring a federal union of all the British North American Provinces, and upon the defeat of the Brown-Dorion Government, he entered the administration of Sir Geo. E. Cartier, pledged to the promotion of a Federal Union. They endeavoured to carry out this promise, but the movement failed, by reason of their inability to secure the co-operation of the Maritime Provinces.

In 1859 the Liberals in the Province of Quebec met in Montreal and declared for a Federal Union of the Canadas.

A similar Convention was held at Toronto for the Upper Canadian Reformers. This convention declared in favour of the formation of two or more local governments, to which should be committed the control of all matters of a local or sectional character, and



some joint authority charged with such matters as were necessarily common to both sections of the Province.

The difficulties of operating the existing constitution compelled men to realize that a change was inevitable. In 1864 the parties were almost evenly divided in the House, and it was impossible for either party to form a stable government.

George Brown moved for the appointment of a Committee to consider the constitutional question and to suggest a solution. The Committee was appointed, composed of representatives of both political parties. This Committee, through George Brown, its chairman, reported in favour of the settlement of the constitutional question, recommending a federative system, applied either to Canada alone or to the whole of the British North American Provinces.

Sir John Macdonald voted against this report. That same day the Conservative government was defeated. Then followed the offer of assistance from George Brown to the government, if the government would undertake to settle the constitutional question. Sir John A. Macdonald not only invited but urged Brown to enter the Ministry. He was quite prepared to support the Government, but he did not desire to become one of its members. The Governor-General strongly urged him to do so, and, during the course of the negotiations, he wrote Mr. Brown:—"I think the success or failure of the negotiations which have been going on for some days, with a view to the formation of a strong government on a broad basis, depends very much on your consenting to come into the Cabinet. . . . Those who have hitherto opposed your views have consented to join with you in good faith for the purpose of extricating the Province from what appears to me a very dangerous situation. They have frankly offered to take up and endeavour to settle on principles satisfactory to all, the great constitutional question which you, by your energy and ability, have made your own. . . . I hope I may, without impropriety, ask you to take these things into consideration before you arrive at a final decision as to your own course." The result was that Brown, with Mowat and McDougall as his colleagues, entered the Government. The new Coalition Government was announced on the 30th June, 1864.

The basis upon which that Government was formed was embodied in a statement given to the House as follows:—"The Government are prepared to pledge themselves to bringing in a measure next Session to remove existing difficulties, by introducing the Federal principle into Canada, coupled with such provisions as will

enable the Maritime Provinces and the Northwest Territory to be incorporated into the same system of government. And the Government will, by sending representatives to the Lower Provinces and to England, use its best endeavours to secure the assent of those interests which are beyond the control of our own legislation to such a measure as may enable all British North America to be united under one Legislature, based upon the federal principle."

George Brown had for years maintained that the ideal to which we should work was a union of all the provinces of Canada, including the Northwest territories, then owned by the Hudson Bay Company. But he was so convinced of the intolerable abuses under the existing form of government and of the urgency of an immediate settlement of the constitutional difficulties of the united provinces, that he was not prepared to make the settlement of these difficulties conditional upon the Lower Provinces entering confederation. The basis, therefore, upon which the new government was formed, was the introduction of the federal principle into Canada, meaning thereby the present provinces of Ontario and Quebec, coupled with such provisions as would enable the Maritime Provinces and the North-west territories to be incorporated into the same system of government.

Fortunately, the Maritime Provinces responded more favourably to the invitation from Canada than they had done some six years before, and more favourably than probably Brown himself expected. The result was Canadian Federation, composed of the Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Subsequently Prince Edward Island and British Columbia entered the Confederation; the North-west territories were acquired from the Hudson Bay Company, and the new Provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, carved out of these territories.

The work of Brown and Macdonald in the consummation of confederation has, I believe, been well and accurately stated by Mr. Willison, when he says: "The Liberal leader established the necessity for confederation; the Conservative leader accepted the situation which his great opponent had created, and Brown and Macdonald joined hands to effect the union.

Not less important than the part taken by Brown and his Liberal associates in promoting the idea of confederation, was the principle for which they fought in the formation of the new government. Sir John Macdonald believed in a legislative union, one government for the whole of Canada, and for this he fought. George Brown believed in a federal union. His idea was a federal parliament controlling matters relating to the whole country, and local legislatures dealing

with local affairs in the several Provinces. George Brown believed that the larger the measure of self government you could give to the Provinces, consistent with a strong central government dealing with matters of national concern, the better it would for the peace, the progress and prosperity of the whole country.

The federal principle triumphed, and everyone recognizes today that it was the triumph of the federal principle, giving the provinces the right to manage their own domestic affairs which has made possible Canadian confederation as we have it today. Just as the triumph of Liberal principles in the struggle for responsible government was a triumph, not only for Canada, but for the other colonies of the Empire, so the triumph of the federal principle in the union of the Provinces of Canada set an example and paved the way for the union of the Australian and South African colonies, and today constitutes one of the great sources of the strength and stability of the Empire.

### Acquirement of the North West Territories.

But if Canada had consisted of a union of the existing Provinces only it would have been but one half the Canada we have today. In order to make the future what it should be, as well as to complete the idea of Confederation, it was necessary that the North West territories should be acquired from the Hudson Bay Company. It is because we have the North West today, with its immense possibilities, that we look forward to the great national development that lies before us.

The great pioneer in advocating the purchase of the North West territories was George Brown, the Liberal leader from Upper Canada. In the year 1851, in his maiden speech in the House, he raised the question of acquiring these territories. In the year of 1852 the *Globe* discussed the question with great clearness and force. In 1856 the *Globe* contained a very remarkable series of articles on the question, and during this year the *Globe* and George Brown took the ground that the time had come to act, and from that time forward the *Globe* carried on "a vigorous campaign for the opening up of the territory for settlement, and the establishment of communication with Canada."

At the Reform Convention, held in Toronto in 1857, it was resolved "that the country known as the Hudson Bay territory ought no longer to be cut off from civilization; that it is the duty of the Legislature and Executive of Canada to open up negotiations with the Imperial Government for the incorporation of the said territory as Canadian soil."

This policy, strongly advocated by the *Globe*, did not meet with the approval of all its contemporaries. Knowing what we do of the North-west today, it is very interesting to see how the proposal of the *Globe* and the Liberal Convention was received at this time. The *Niagara Mail*, commenting on the *Globe's* position said: "*The Toronto Globe* comes out with a new and remarkable platform, one of the planks of which is the annexation of the frozen regions of the Hudson Bay territory to Canada. Lord have mercy on us! Canada has already a stiff reputation for cold in the world, but it is unfeeling in the *Globe* to want to make it deserving of the reproach." Similar views appear to have been extant in this city. The *Montreal Transcript* pointed out that the climate was unfavourable to the growth of grain, that the summer was too short in duration, so that even the few fertile spots could "with difficulty mature a small potato or cabbage."

But George Brown was undaunted. He kept pressing the matter upon public attention. He pictured to the people that the time would come when "the British American flag shall proudly wave from Labrador to Vancouver Island, and from our own Niagara to the shores of the Hudson Bay." In the Coalition Government of 1864, formed to bring about confederation, George Brown brought the issue to the front, and in 1865, when he and his colleagues went over to confer with the Imperial Government on the question of confederation, they discussed the acquirement of the North-west territories, and secured the assent of the Imperial Government to the transfer of these territories to Canada. In the British North America Act, provision was made for incorporating them into the Canadian Confederation.

It was Mr. McDougall, one of the Liberal members of the Coalition Government formed after the Union, who presented to the Canadian House of Commons the petition to the British Government to acquire the rights of the Hudson Bay Company in these territories. In 1869 Mr. McDougall and Sir George Cartier went over to England and completed the negotiations for the acquisition of these territories, to the great benefit of Canada and of the Empire as a whole.

Here again it was the policy of the Liberal leader and the Liberal party which forced this great question to the front, and was so largely instrumental in securing these territories for Canada.

### Changed Status of Canada.

When Sir Wilfrid Laurier went to England to attend the Diamond Jubilee of Queen Victoria, in one of his very first public utterances he took the position that Canada was no longer a colony

but a nation. He said "The authority of the Queen does not rest on military force, but from the Pacific to the Atlantic rests on the cheerful allegiance of 5,000,000 people who feel themselves a nation. The feeling dominating Canada is one of pride in her local autonomy and legislative liberty connected with Imperial unity." Throughout his stay in Great Britain, Sir Wilfrid consistently maintained the position that Canada had reached the status of a nation.

When he returned to the City of Montreal, and the citizens extended such a memorable welcome to him, he again emphasized that position. He said he had longed to live to see the day when Canada would no longer be a colony, but would be a free nation within the Empire, and he was glad to be able to say he had lived to see that day.

What was the attitude of the Conservative press in regard to this? They charged Sir Wilfrid with being a separatist. I have an extract from the *Mail* commenting on his speech, which I would like to read to you. "There are two courses open to us. We may drift away from the British circle, or we may cleave closer to it, and add to its lustre. Sir Wilfrid's position surely speaks for itself. 'I would say that for many many years, it has been my hope that I would not close my eyes, that I would not sink into the grave before I had seen Canada lifted up to the state of a nation.' Out of this rhodomontade, united with the assertion that another Star of Liberty is rising in the West, we gather that Sir Wilfrid's present notions are the natural sequel to his anti-preferential proceedings in England. He works upon the term nation to give a pleasant flavour to his policy of drift from our British Empire, but no one will be beguiled by this bit of by-play."

Other Conservative journals and leaders of the Conservative party, took the same position and indulged in the same criticism. They failed to perceive that which Sir Wilfrid and those who shared his views saw, that there could be no permanent basis of union and no permanent plan for co-operation between the peoples of the Empire with a dominant race living in one country, to which those living in the self-governing Dominion would be more or less subject: that the future of the Empire, as well as its strength and stability depended upon a frank recognition of equality in the status of the people in the self-governing dominions with those of the mother country. This assertion of our national status was necessary for the people of Canada to develop our own national self-consciousness and our own self-respect. It was necessary for the people of Great Britain, in order that they might realize that they were dealing, not with subjects, but with fellow citizens.



That this is our position, that we are now a nation, is not only recognized by the statesmen of Canada, but it is equally recognized by the statesmen of the Mother Country. Let me give you one or two instances to show you how clearly the changed view has taken possession of the public mind in Great Britain, as well of the public mind in Canada. Sir Frederick Pollock, one of the leading English jurists, said "Leave the conventions alone and look at the facts, and we find the self-governing colonies are, in fact, separate kingdoms, having the same King as the parent group, but choosing to abrogate that part of their full autonomy which relates to foreign affairs. The House of Commons could no more venture to pass a bill altering the Australian marriage laws, or the Canadian tariff, than the Dominion Parliament could legislate on London Tramways. The Sovereignty is a figment. The States of the Empire stand on an equal footing, except that the Government of one of them represents all the rest of the community of nations, and is gracefully permitted, in consequence, to undertake and to pay for maritime defence."

Nowhere have I seen this changed relationship more clearly stated than in an article on the Imperial Conference written by the Editor of the Round Table. Referring to the resolution passed by the Colonial Conference in 1907, establishing the Imperial Conference, this writer says:—

"This resolution established the status of the Dominions as national entities, entirely distinct from that which inhabited the British Isles. It recognized that the basis of Imperial organization was the co-operation of five nations, not the centralization of power in the hands of the British Government as an Imperial Parliament. It finally destroyed the older conception of Imperial development, as a gradual re-union of the colonies with the mother country through representatives in either of the British Houses of Parliament."

Mr. Balfour, speaking at a luncheon given at the Constitutional Club to the Prime Ministers of the Overseas Dominions, in 1911, said:—

"I cannot help thinking that as we have now thoroughly realized in every one of these great communities that each is to manage its own affairs—carry out its own life, make its own experiments as freely as if it were an independent political entity—as that is a truth thoroughly understood by every politician of every party in every one of these several communities—I cannot help thinking that upon that solid basis we shall build up something which the world has never yet seen, which political dreamers in the past have never yet dreamed

of—a coalition of free and self-governing communities who feel that they are never more themselves, never more masters of their own fate, than when they recognize that they are parts of a greater whole, from which they can draw inspiration and strength; and that each lives its own life and is most itself when it feels itself in the fullest sense a self governing entity which yet has a larger whole to look to, whose interests are not alien to it, on whom it can rest in time of trouble, from whom it can draw experience, to whom it can look, whom it can aid, and from whom it can receive aid."

Mr. Asquith, at the opening session of the Imperial Conference of 1911, said:—

"Two things in the British Empire were unique in the history of great political aggregations—the reign of law and the combination of local autonomy with the loyalty to a common head. In proportion as centralization was seen to be increasingly absurd, so had disintegration been felt to be increasingly impossible."

"We each of us are, and we each of us intend to remain, master in our own household. This is, here at home and throughout the Dominions, the lifeblood of our policy. It is the 'articulus stantis' and 'cadentis imperii.' It is none the less true that we are, and intend to remain, units indeed, but units in a greater unity. And it is the primary object and governing purpose of these periodical conferences that we take free counsel together in the matter which concerns us all."

Some of the most important changes in our British constitutional system were not brought about by any act of parliament or legislature, but by the demand on the one hand for new or enlarged rights and powers, and the recognition of these rights and powers on the other. This momentous change from a colony of Great Britain to that of one of the free nations of the Empire did not require any Act of Parliament—British or Canadian—for its consummation. It simply required a demand on our part for a new status and the acceptance and recognition of that new status on the part of Great Britain.

I venture to suggest that when the history of our constitutional development is written, among the great things that Sir Wilfrid Laurier has done, none will appear greater than his perception of the fact that the status of Canada must be changed and that this change must be brought about, not by legislative enactment, but by the demand on our part for a new status, persisted in until the people of Canada were convinced of its necessity, persisted in until the statesmen of Great Britain were convinced that it was right. By this great achievement Sir Wilfrid has enlarged the liberties and improved the

status of every Canadian citizen, and what he has done for Canada he has done for all the self-governing dominions. The welcome which Mr. Borden and his colleagues received last June was only made possible because of the work Sir Wilfrid and his colleagues had done for Canada.

Today we stand in our relationships and in our negotiations, both in the mind of the people of the mother country and in the mind of the people of the other self governing dominions, as one of the five free nations that go to make up the Empire. It is again the work of Liberal leaders and the triumph of the Liberal policy which has laid the broad foundation upon which alone the future strength and security of the Empire can rest.

### **The Development of an Imperial Organization.**

Some of our Conservative friends are very fond of talking about Imperial organization, they are fond of talking about representation in some Imperial body, they are talking about Canada having some voice in Imperial affairs. While they have been talking and dreaming the Liberal leaders of Canada, and the Liberal leaders of Great Britain and of the other Dominions, have been creating a truly Imperial organization for dealing with Imperial affairs.

We have in the Imperial Conference a truly representative body which, up to the present time, has proved itself capable of dealing with all important matters of Imperial concern. It was formed by the resolution of the Colonial Conference of 1907. It meets every four years, and oftener if necessary. It has a permanent secretariat. Its members are, ex officio, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, and the Prime Ministers of the self-governing Dominions. The Secretary of State for the Colonies is also an ex-officio member, and takes the chair in the absence of the President. He arranges for such Imperial Conferences after communication with the Prime Ministers of the Dominions. Such other ministers as the respective governments may appoint are also members of the Conference—it being understood that except by special permission of the Conference, each discussion will be conducted by not more than two representatives from each Government, and that each Government will have only one vote.

It is important for us to bear in mind some of the characteristics of this Conference. It recognizes the national status of the Dominions, as distinct from the mother country; it is truly representative in its character, being composed of the Prime Ministers of the mother country and self-governing Dominions; it is responsible in that each

Prime Minister has back of him a parliamentary majority, and therefore has the power to implement the resolutions to which he gives assent; it recognizes the autonomy of all the governments and no resolution affecting any particular government can become effective unless assented to by it.

In view of the recent discussions on the character and personnel of the Committee of Imperial Defence, it is of interest to note that after the Colonial Conference of 1907 had settled the constitution of the Imperial Conference, it also by resolution provided for colonial representation on the Committee of Imperial Defence when matters affecting the colonies should be brought up for consideration, but under this resolution the Committee of Imperial Defence would be purely an advisory body to any particular colony or dominion which desired to secure its advice, as at the present time it is an advisory body to the British Government on matters of defence.

It is well to keep clearly before us the difference in the character, the personnel and functions of the Imperial Conference and the Committee of Imperial Defence. The Committee of Imperial Defence consists of the Prime Minister of Great Britain as the only permanent member, and such other persons as he may invite to sit as members of the Committee. The *London Times* recently pointed out that "In normal times it consists of the Secretaries for Foreign Affairs, the Colonies, War and India, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the First Lord of the Admiralty, the Permanent Secretaries and other important officers of these departments and one or two others—such as Lord Haldane and Lord Kitchener, specially nominated by the Prime Minister with the approval of the King." The functions of the Committee, as described in the memorandum circulated to the Colonial Conference in 1907, are "(a) To facilitate common discussion and agreement as to matters of Imperial Defence which fall within the purview of more than one department, and which otherwise might involve long and indecisive correspondence; (b) To advise in case of any questions relating to local or general defence which may be referred to it by the Secretary of State at the request of the self-governing colonies; (c) To bring naval and military experts into direct touch with the Ministers, who are enabled to question them freely and fully, thus avoiding the misunderstandings which may arise from minutes and memoranda. The Committee is a purely consultative body, having no executive powers or administrative functions . . . . . Questions are referred to the Committee by the Prime Minister, or by the head of a Department of State. When special information is required the Prime Minister may summon any person who may be in

possession of such information. When a colonial question is discussed, either the Secretary of State for the Colonies or another representative of the Colonial Office is present."

You will see from the constitution and character of the Committee of Imperial Defence that it is not representative or responsible to anybody except the British Prime Minister and the British Cabinet, to which it bears an advisory relation, and while representation on it serves a useful purpose, we should not make the mistake of endeavouring to exalt this Committee into the place of a truly representative and responsible body like the Imperial Conference, an organization which so far has rendered such splendid service to all parts of the Empire, and which, if it continues to develop in the future as it has in the past—to meet the exigencies of our inter-imperial relationships as they arise—may ultimately prove to be the real organ of government for the whole Empire.

But Sir Wilfrid's contribution towards securing for us a safe and effective Imperial organization is not limited to his suggestions as to the form and work of the Imperial Conference. He has also done good work for Canada and the Empire in assisting to defeat proposals for Imperial organizations which would have seriously impaired our rights of self-government. In so doing, he was not only fighting for Canada, but he was fighting for the whole Empire. Because, if there is one thing we of the British race have inherited from the men of the old land it is the belief that we are capable of governing ourselves, and that we are entitled to do so. We believe also that you cannot build up an Empire of British freemen the world over unless you give to the men of the Dominions the same status as those in the mother land of so many of us.

### **Imperial Trade Relations.**

There are four outstanding events in the development of our trade relations with Great Britain: (1) the withdrawal in 1846 of the preference to Canada in the British markets; (2) the imposition of a protective tariff against Great Britain first in 1859 and again in 1879 and the following years; (3) the granting of the preference to Great Britain in 1897 and the subsequent increase in this preference; (4) the creation of an Imperial Trade Commission. Let me trace the records of the two parties on these questions of trade.

So early as 1840 it appears to have been one of the articles of faith of the Conservative leaders, both in Great Britain and in Canada,



that it was necessary, in order to maintain the Imperial tie, to bind Canada to Great Britain by a trade preference. On the other hand, the Liberal contention was: give to Canada full responsible government and let Great Britain and Canada in trade matters do what each considers best for herself, and you will thereby most effectually maintain the ties of affectionate loyalty which bind Canada to the mother country.

Lord Stanley, who fought against granting Canada responsible government, because this would sever the tie, stated in the House of Commons in 1842 :—

"The sense of union is to be cherished by means of strict Commercial connection, carrying with it mutual advantages. It is such a sense that will keep our colonies together. If we deprive the colonies of this sense of mutual commercial advantage we would diminish the strength arising from union."

The Conservative view as thus expressed bears such a striking resemblance to the view we have so often heard in recent years, that I am sure you will be interested in hearing it.

With the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846 by the Peel government, supported by the Liberals, the preference disappeared. Lord Stanley, speaking on this question in the House of Lords, said :— "Destroy this principle of protection and you destroy the whole basis upon which your colonial system rests."

This view was shared by the Tory party in Canada, and a resolution of remonstrance was passed by the Parliament of Canada, in 1846 and transmitted by the Governor-General to the Colonial Secretary. The following is an extract from this resolution:—"It is much to be feared that should the inhabitants of Canada, from the withdrawal of all protection to their staple products, find that they cannot successfully compete with their neighbours of the United States in the only market open to them, they will naturally and of necessity begin to doubt whether remaining a portion of the British Empire will be of that paramount advantage which they have hitherto found it to be."

Mr. Gladstone was Colonial Secretary at the time, and his answer to this Resolution of the Canadian Parliament is very good. He said:—"It would be a source of the greatest pain to her Majesty's Government if they could share in the impression that the connection between that country and Canada derived its force from the exchange of commercial preferences only. That might be a relation consisting in the exchange not of benefits but of burdens. Her Majesty's

Government hoped that the connection rested upon a firmer basis, upon resemblance in origin, laws, and manners, in what inwardly binds men and communities of men together, as well as in the close association of material interests, which interests, however, they felt would be advanced by commercial freedom. The people of Canada could not desire that the market for their farm products should be maintained by means of a perpetual tax upon the people of England."

Believe the Canadian Liberals, not only of 1846, but of 1912, would accept this statement of Mr. Gladstone as setting forth the true basis upon which the connection between Canada and Great Britain rests.

To complete the story, I think I should give you the comment of the *Toronto Globe* (then edited by George Brown) upon this sample of Conservative loyalty. "The comments of these papers afforded an admirable illustration of the selfishness of Toryism. Give them everything they could desire, and they are brimful of loyalty. They would chant paens till they were sick, and drink goblets till they were blind, in praise of 'wise and benevolent Governors' who gave them all the offices and all the emoluments. But, let their interest, real or imaginary, be effected, and how soon did their loyalty evaporate! Now, there was talk of separation from the Mother Country unless the mother would continue to feed them in the method prescribed by the child. Tory loyalty was estimated in pounds, shillings and pence. When these were withdrawn it sustained a complete collapse. It was a strange thing, the Tory's loyalty. You might trample on every privilege, you might oppose the passage of every good law, you might enact class legislation by which the interests of the many were entirely sacrificed for the few, and you would not disturb the Tory's loyalty. He seemed to be the better pleased to show his loyalty for the preservation of things as they were. But the moment the Government ventured legislation on a broad, just and comprehensive scale, the Tory's loyalty vanished."

When men who dearly loved their country were constantly charged with being disloyal no wonder they used strong language in reply. We, of course would not use such language today.

I wish to point out to you that when this question of trade arose in a crucial form between Canada and Great Britain the Liberal attitude was—"Let the mother country do what is best in her own interest and we will do what we consider best in ours, and that their course would not in the least affect our loyalty." The Conservative attitude was—"Unless you continue to feed us by preference, the connection may not be as valuable as we otherwise thought it would

be." Some of the distinguished leaders of the Conservative party in the city of Montreal emphasized this view by issuing the famous "Annexation Manifesto" of 1848-1849.

Lord Elgin was a very wise man. He saw this annexation cry grow out of economic conditions. He thought he saw a method of removing the pressure and offering relief to those who were suffering. He went over to the United States and negotiated the Treaty of Reciprocity. The annexation sentiment died, and the Conservatives who held annexation views, became just as loyal as their neighbours.

### **Protective Tariff against Great Britain.**

The next event I will mention was the enactment of the Tariff against Great Britain, in 1859. There was a protest by British merchants against the imposition of this tariff. They still looked upon Canada as a colony and considered that one of its chief purposes was to purchase British goods, therefore when a law was passed by the Canadian Parliament raising the tariff upon British goods, British merchants quite naturally resented it.

The reply of the Conservative Government of Canada is very interesting from two standpoints. First, it shows how completely the Conservative party leaders in Canada accepted the principle of responsible government and the right of Canada to manage her own affairs, against which they had so strenuously contended; and, secondly, the forceful, if not curt, way in which they maintained the right of Canada to tax British goods, a right which has been repeatedly asserted and consistently exercised by the leaders of the Conservative party ever since.

"Self government would be utterly annihilated if the views of the Imperial Government were to be preferred to those of the people of Canada. It is therefore the duty of the present government distinctly to affirm the right of the Canadian Legislature to adjust the taxation of the people in the way they deem best, even should it unfortunately happen to meet the disapproval of the Imperial Minister. Her Majesty cannot be allowed to disallow such acts unless her advisers are prepared to assume the administration of the colony, irrespective of the views of the inhabitants."

### **The Imperial Preference of 1897.**

You know the attitude of the two parties on this very important matter. The Conservative policy was—"We will not give Great

Britain a preference in our markets until she gives us a corresponding preference in hers." The Liberal policy was—"In revising our tariff and in reducing our duties, we should make a greater reduction as against goods imported from Great Britain than from other countries, that we should thereby give Great Britain a preference in our markets over other countries. The British preference—first of  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., then of 25 per cent. and finally of  $33\frac{1}{3}$  per cent.—has greatly stimulated trade between Canada and Great Britain, and the splendid example of Canada has now been followed by Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. The Liberals in this case, as in the past, manifested their loyalty by practical action, good for Canada and good for Great Britain. It was good for Canada not only because it reduced a measure of the taxation on our own consumers, but it enabled us to secure the denunciation of the Belgian and German trade treaties, which had hitherto hampered our action in dealing with trade matters. It was good for Great Britain, because it enlarged the markets for the merchants of Great Britain and it awakened in the minds of the people of Great Britain a deeper appreciation of Canada's position and of her devotion to the mother country.

If the Conservative policy had been followed, the Belgian and German treaties would, in all probability, have been in force today, and there would have been no British preference, either in Canada, Australia, New Zealand or South Africa.

### **The Imperial Trade Commission.**

At the Imperial Conference of 1911, Sir Wilfrid Laurier introduced a resolution to provide for the appointment of an Imperial Trade Commission, to consist of representatives of the mother country and of the self-governing Dominions. The work of the Commission was to investigate the natural resources and the trade possibilities of the different portions of the Empire, and to consider and report the lines along which trade could be most advantageously developed and stimulated between the different portions of the Empire.

Sir Joseph Ward, Prime Minister of New Zealand, speaking at the close of the Imperial Conference, said that if the representatives of the Dominions, who had gathered from all parts of the Empire, had done nothing else but pass this one resolution and provided for the creation of this Commission, the Imperial Conference would have

been well worth while. This Imperial Trade Commission provides a wise, safe and practicable method for promoting trade within the Empire. It is due to the action of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in promoting this resolution before the Imperial Conference that our friend Hon. George E. Foster now owes his position on this Imperial Trade Commission.

Here again, while our opponents have been talking loyalty, the Liberal leaders have been, by practical measures, cementing the trade bonds which help to bind together the different parts of the Empire.

### **Imperial Defence.**

There are four outstanding features in the development of Canadian national defence : first, the assumption by Canada of her own land defences; second, the assumption by Canada of responsibility for her own naval defence; third, the working out of a plan for co-operation, both in land defence and in naval defence, between the forces of Canada and those of the mother country; fourth, the participation of Canada in the wars of the Empire.

Let me take up these features in order, first dealing with the assumption by us of our own land defences. This was done at the time of Confederation. It was part of the agreement at the time Confederation was formed, an agreement entered into by the Coalition Government formed to carry confederation, and was therefore done by and with the consent of both political parties. There is no question that the leaders of the Conservative party had been active in promoting measures for the land defence of Canada.

### **Naval Defence.**

In 1887, at the Colonial Conference, the representatives of the mother country made an appeal to the representatives of the colonies to assist in the naval defence of the Empire; not that they should assist in maintaining the Imperial fleet, not that they should assist in maintaining generally the coaling stations or the naval bases, but that they should do what the crown colonies were doing—that is, assist in maintaining the naval bases, which were really an insurance of colonial property.

Australia responded to that appeal, and said she would make a contribution to support the navy, if Great Britain provided an auxiliary squadron in Australian waters. This was subsequently



embodied in an agreement, which, with certain modifications, continued until Australia undertook the development of her own naval force.

What answer did Canada make? Canada, not represented by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, but Canada, represented by Sir John Macdonald. What reply did Canada make to that appeal of the mother country to assist in the naval defence? As a recent writer has said: "Canada was unable to make any contribution. She quoted the promise of the British Government, made during the negotiations preceding Confederation in 1867, to undertake the naval defence of the proposed Dominion provided Canada spent not less than two hundred thousand pounds a year on her own land defence, and considered her obligations to the Empire discharged by the expenditure of this sum."

What would some of our ultra-Tory friends have said if that answer had been given by Sir Wilfrid Laurier?

From 1887 down to date the British Government has been presenting to us the urgency and importance of our assisting in naval defence. In 1896 the Conservative party went out of power, and the Liberal party, which had not professed so much loyalty, but which expressed its loyalty in its acts, came into office. At the Imperial Conference of 1902 the representatives of Canada stated that Canada contemplated establishing her own naval service, and offered to take over the naval bases at Halifax and Esquimaux. In 1905 that offer was accepted, and they were subsequently taken over.

At the Colonial Conference of 1907, Canada intimated that she intended proceeding further in the establishment of her own naval force, and at the subsidiary Conference in 1909 the policy was worked out.

In the year 1909, the Canadian House of Commons unanimously passed a resolution declaring Canada's readiness to assume her share in naval defence. When it only requires professions our opponents will stand with us, but when it requires action, our opponents apparently are not to be found. They agreed with this resolution, but when the government came to put the resolution into effect, they found that our Conservative friends had changed their minds. Some thought the government went too far and some not far enough and they voted against the proposals of the Government for the establishment of a Canadian naval service.

At the Colonial Conference of 1907, Australia took this very striking course—her representatives said to the representatives of the mother country: "For years we have been making a money

contribution to the naval defence of the Empire, you agreeing to maintain an auxiliary squadron in our waters. This is not satisfactory to us, and it is not satisfactory to you." Although there was an agreement in existence extending over a number of years, they asked the consent of the mother country to terminate that agreement, in order that they might develop their own naval force, and police the Australian waters with their own ships. The mother country consented and accepted the Australian offer.

At the subsidiary Naval Conference, held in 1909, between Great Britain, Canada and Australia, the basis for development by Canada and Australia of their own naval forces was worked out.

In 1910 our Parliament passed the Naval Service Act, which contains all the provision necessary for developing as large a naval service as Canada may desire to provide—in fact if the present Government wishes to act, all it has to do is to ask the House of Commons to make the necessary appropriations, and the Naval Service Act of 1910 contains all the provisions necessary to develop a Canadian navy. Men may differ as to the number and character of the ships which should compose our fleet—this is a matter of detail—but time will vindicate the policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for a Canadian navy as the wise and statesmanlike policy, both for Canada and the Empire.

### **Co-operation in Naval and Land Defence.**

In 1911 the representatives of Canada met the representatives of Great Britain and the representatives of Australia, and they worked out together a plan for the co-operation of the fleets of the Empire, both in peace and war. In the first place they recognized the autonomy of the Dominions, and their right to control their own fleets. Secondly, they delimited the areas in which Australia and Canada should fly the flag, protect the commerce and maintain the honour of the Empire. They gave Australia a portion of the Southern Pacific adjacent to the Commonwealth of Australia. They gave Canada the west half of the North Atlantic and the east half of the North Pacific. Australia is building the ships to fly the flag and protect the commerce in her portion of the high seas, and if the Liberal party (which expresses its loyalty in its acts) had been returned to power Canada would be building her ships too.

The agreement further provides that in time of war, so soon as the Dominions place their fleets at the disposal of the Admiralty,

they remain at the disposal of the Admiralty until the war is ended, securing unity in command and control.

I am sure you will be interested in hearing what the *London Times*, the great organ of the Unionist party in Great Britain, has to say about this agreement, which has been so adversely criticised by our Conservative friends. "With good will on all sides, and with mutual forbearance and mutual concession, has been solved—and in our judgment well and wisely solved—the momentous and infinitely difficult problem of combining complete local autonomy in time of peace with organic solidarity of tradition, spirit, training and discipline at all times, and in time of war with absolute unity of strategic direction and control, so far as in any future war the Dominions affected are prepared to place their naval forces at the disposal of the Imperial Government. It will be held by some, perhaps, that the limiting condition here indicated vitiates the whole arrangement and renders it largely nugatory; but we entirely repudiate that view. We have a just confidence in the patriotism of the Dominions; and the condition embodied in the memorial is only the expression of the accepted doctrine, that the part, whether great or small, to be taken by a Dominion in any war in which the Empire is engaged must, so far as it is not determined by the action of the enemy, be determined exclusively by the Dominion itself, and not in any sense or degree by the Imperial Government. . . . .

The navies of the Dominions, although indigenous and autonomous, will, under the provisions of the Memorandum be organic offshoots of the parent Navy of the United Kingdom. They will fly the common flag of the Royal Navy. They will be under the King's Regulations and Admiralty Instructions, and the Naval Discipline Act. . . . . Taken as a whole, the Memorandum is a well conceived and eminently practical solution of the very difficult problem of bringing three naval forces—possibly more hereafter—which are to be under separate administration, into such close and organic relations that, even in time of peace, the advantages of a single Imperial fleet will be to a very large extent secured, and in time of war an Imperial fleet, single and indivisible in direction and control and instinct with a common inspiration and discipline, will automatically come into existence, subject only to the established autonomy and discretion of the several Dominions concerned."

To-day, we are not prepared to undertake our share in Imperial Defence. We are not preparing to stand side by side with Australia. We are not preparing to help the mother country bear the burden of the defence of the Empire, because the Liberal Government,

which believed in action, has gone out of power, and is succeeded by a government which is not able to make up its mind.

How can it reconcile the irreconcilable elements within its own bosom? How can it reconcile any action it may take with the pledges it made to secure Nationalist support in Quebec against the Liberal Government, because it was undertaking on behalf of Canada a share in the defence of the Empire, and with the attacks it made upon the Liberal Government in Ontario and other parts of Canada because, they said, the Liberal Government was not doing enough for the Defence of the Empire? But Parliament is soon to meet, and Mr. Borden and his colleagues have promised us that they will make up their minds and tell us what they are going to do. We will all await with interest a statement of what Canada's permanent naval policy shall be. To longer delay a statement is to shirk a grave national and Imperial responsibility. To shirk such a responsibility may constitute a real national emergency.

It was in connection with the Imperial Conference of 1907 that the Resolution providing for the development of an Imperial General staff was passed, in order to bring into harmony the training, discipline and organization of the forces of the whole Empire.

In the year 1907 the Imperial staff was created. In 1911 the Imperial staff reported the progress so far made to the Imperial Conference.

Under the Liberal administration, while maintaining the full autonomy and the national rights of Canada, plans have been steadily worked out for the defence of the Empire and the co-operation of all the forces of the Empire in all national emergencies.

### **Canada's Participation in the Wars of the Empire.**

Lastly, we have the question of Canada taking part in the wars of the Empire. Mr. Willison, in his life of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, points out that in the year 1885, during the war in the Soudan, New South Wales offered the Imperial Government a body of troops. This induced Lord Hartington, the Secretary for War, to put himself into communication with the other Colonies. The Canadian Government, however, replied to the intimation that colonial aid would be received, by offering to sanction recruiting in Canada for service in Egypt or elsewhere, but stipulated that the entire cost must fall on the Imperial Exchequer. The War Office, in reply to Canada, said:

"The offer of the Government of New South Wales, which has been accepted by Her Majesty's Government, was to provide an organized force, fully equipped and ready for immediate service, and the Government of the Dominion will, no doubt, fully appreciate the difference between the two offers as regards the use which could be made of them by Her Majesty's Government, and will not, Lord Hartington feels sure, consider that in declining their patriotic offer for the present any undue preference has been given to the Colony of New South Wales."

This was Canada, not under Sir Wilfrid Laurier, but under Sir John Macdonald. I am not now criticising the course pursued by Sir John and his colleagues on this occasion, but I would like to ask you this question, what would our ultra-loyalist Conservative friends have said if Sir Wilfrid Laurier had been at the head of the Government in 1885, and this answer had been made by him? You all know the answer to this question.

It was reserved to Canada, under the Liberal administration, headed by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, to act differently. When in 1898 the war in South Africa was being fought, Canada took her share, as one of the nations of the Empire, in the military defence of the Empire. The action of Canada and the other self-governing Dominions in participating with Great Britain in the war in South Africa was a splendid demonstration of essential unity of the Empire and possibility of effective co-operation in all national emergencies.

In view of the discussions which have recently taken place, both in the British and Canadian press on the question of Colonial neutrality, it is only fair to point out in considering the attitude of the Government of Sir John Macdonald, that the position taken by Sir John and his colleagues in declining to participate in the war in Egypt was not a declaration of colonial neutrality. It is well for us to keep clearly in mind the distinction between neutrality and non-participation. As Sir John Macdonald would undoubtedly have said, and as Sir Wilfrid Laurier has repeatedly said, whenever the Empire is at war, Canada, as part of the Empire, is at war also. In the past 100 years Great Britain has been engaged in, I suppose, over a score of wars, and yet in none of those which have occurred outside of this continent have Canadian troops participated, except in the war in South Africa. No statesman of Canada has ever proclaimed the doctrine of Colonial neutrality, but what Canadian statesmen have said, and truly said, is that the government of Canada must decide the character and extent of the participation which Canada takes in the war. It is the Parliament which must vote the supplies. On



this important matter, if I read history aright, Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Sir John Macdonald have taken exactly the same position, except that the government of Sir John exercised the right to decide by refusing to participate, the Government of Sir Wilfrid by participating.

I am sorry time does not permit me to mention other great and important acts of co-operation, not only of national, but of Imperial significance, worked out by the Liberal party in this country, for there is a great deal more to be said, but I must conclude.

While I have dwelt upon the services of the Liberal party to the Empire, I have done so because of the constant claim of our Conservative opponents that they in some sense are the guardians and exponents of the truly loyal and patriotic ideals of the Canadian people. Surely the time has come when we can be broad minded enough and patriotic enough to give to each other credit for equal devotion to the highest and best interests of both Canada and the Empire, though we may differ, and widely differ, as to the best methods of promoting these interests.

While I would not for a moment suggest that the Conservative party is not just as loyal as the Liberal party, while I would not for a moment suggest that there is any real difference between the two political parties in their affection for and devotion to the Crown and Empire, there are nevertheless certain conclusions, which, as Canadian citizens and as Liberals, I think we should draw from this brief review of our history, and the first is this: that in the development of our political relations, in the promotion of trade within the Empire, and in practical co-operation for the defence of the Empire, the impartial historian must record that the principles and policies and efforts of the Liberal party have on the one hand enlarged the liberties, increased the power and improved the status of the people of the Dominions, and on the other have strengthened the ties that bind the Dominions to the mother country and have helped lay the foundations broad and secure for the future of the Empire.

We all now recognize that the Crown and not the Parliament of Great Britain is the real bond of union which binds together all portions of the Empire, and that just in proportion as liberty has been granted to the outlying portions of the Empire to manage their own affairs, so has the loyalty and affection for the Crown and person of our Sovereign increased. Today we all recognize the great honour which has been paid to Canada by the appointment of the brother of our late Sovereign as our Governor-General, and Canadians, because of their affection for and devotion to the Crown and person of our gracious Sovereign, have welcomed with peculiar pleasure and

unbounded enthusiasm our present Governor-General, the illustrious uncle of our reigning sovereign, and his presence among us cannot but help to still further strengthen the devotion of all Canadians to the Crown, which he so worthily represents.

We further recognize that the largest powers of self-government have tended to promote the peace, the progress and prosperity of our country; that the exercise of these powers has not only been compatible with, but essential to, the maintenance of the Imperial tie;

That co-operation between the self-governing nations of the Empire, not the centralization of power in the hands of one, is the only safe and sure basis for the future unity, strength and security of the Empire;

That it is the triumph of Liberal principles and of Liberal policies in the development of our Imperial relations which makes the Empire possible to-day, and by our adherence to these principles we shall best guarantee its strength and its permanence;

That through consultation and co-operation in the work we should do together, we are steadily and surely working out a truly imperial organization, which with the Crown shall be the visible bond of union between all the free nations of the Empire;

That in the great national crises through which our Dominion has passed our success has been made possible by the hearty co-operation and brilliant leadership of some of the noblest sons of the Province of Quebec. And, we should not forget, those of us who speak another language, that in these great days and in these great struggles to which I have referred, for every Liberal leader in Upper Canada there has been a Liberal leader in this Province of Quebec, who has maintained the Liberal principles, and has helped to secure the triumph of these principles;

That having claimed the status of a nation, and our rights being recognized, we must be prepared to accept national responsibilities. Our own self-respect forbids us claiming a national position and shirking national responsibilities. With the increasing wealth that comes from the development of our resources, with the increasing strength that comes from an ever-increasing population, and the growth and expansion which lie before us, Canada must take an ever increasing part in the affairs of the Empire; seeking to work with the other nations of the Empire to maintain the highest and best traditions of the race.

In the matter of naval defence the time for talking is past, the time for action has come. We should be ashamed to permit the

people of Great Britain,—financially burdened as they are and must continue to be in working out great measures of social reform for the benefit of the masses of the people—to not only bear their own burden of naval defence, but to bear ours as well. Our action should be prompt, not because of any so-called "emergency," but because action is overdue, and our own self-respect will no longer permit us to let the mother country bear our responsibilities. Our action should be adequate, commensurate with our ability and our share of the burden. Our policy should not be the product of a momentary enthusiasm or of unworthy fear, but as part of a permanent and well considered plan whereby Canada will undertake her share in the defence of the Empire. Let our policy not be formed by or shaped in response to the spirit of militarism. Our Navy is not for aggression, but for the defence of our coasts and the protection of our trade routes; for the maintenance of the traditions and ideals for which our British system of government and our flag stand.

And we have something worth maintaining. We have a great inheritance handed down to us. Under no other system of government is there such liberty to the individual, such strength and security to the State. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, speaking for Canada, General Botha speaking for South Africa, meeting together with the statesmen of the Empire at the Imperial Conference last year, and framing policies for the benefit of the Empire, is a spectacle never before seen, and which could not be witnessed in any other country or under any other flag than ours.

Let us in our thoughts of the past and in our thoughts of the future, not forget the fact that in the past fifteen years—the greatest constructive period in the development of our Imperial relations—it was an illustrious son of the Province of Quebec, who, as our representative, helped to achieve those great things for Canada and for Empire.

**THE DOMINION PRINTING  
AND LOOSE LEAF CO.  
95 GEORGE ST. - OTTAWA**